

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FI | LING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|---------------------------|---------|-------------|----------------------|--------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/680,886 | 1 | 10/08/2003 | Hiroyuki Tanaka | 693.007 | 693.007 6440 | |
| 23598 | 7590 | 01/26/2006 | | EXAMINER | | |
| BOYLE FR | EDRICK | SON NEWHOLM | WONG, ERIC K | | | |
| 250 E. WISC SUITE 1030 | ONSIN A | VENUE | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| MILWAUKE | E, WI | 53202 | | 2883 | | |

DATE MAILED: 01/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | | Н |
|--|--|--|---|-----------|
| | | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | | 10/680,886 | TANAKA ET AL. | |
| | Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | | Eric Wong | 2883 | |
| Period fo | The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply | ears on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence addre | 'SS |
| WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any | ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE of the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI | I. lely filed the mailing date of this comm D (35 U.S.C. § 133). | |
| Status | RCE | | | |
| 1)🖂 | Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 De | <u>ecember 2005</u> . | | |
| 2a) <u></u> ☐ | This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This | action is non-final. | | |
| 3) | Since this application is in condition for allowar | nce except for formal matters, pro | secution as to the m | erits is |
| | closed in accordance with the practice under E | x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45 | 3 O.G. 213. | |
| Disposit | ion of Claims | | | |
| 4) 🖂 | Claim(s) 1-16 and 18-20 is/are pending in the a | application. | | |
| | 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw | vn from consideration. | | |
| 5) 🗌 | Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | |
| 6)⊠ | Claim(s) 1-16 and 18-20 is/are rejected. | | | |
| 7) | Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | |
| 8) | Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or | r election requirement. | | |
| Applicat | ion Papers | · | | |
| 9) | The specification is objected to by the Examine | r. | | |
| | The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce | | xaminer. | |
| | Applicant may not request that any objection to the | drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See | 37 CFR 1.85(a). | |
| | Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti | ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj | ected to. See 37 CFR | 1.121(d). |
| 11) | The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex | aminer. Note the attached Office | Action or form PTO- | 152. |
| Priority (| under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | • | | |
| | Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents application from the International Bureau | s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been receive | on No | age |
| * 5 | See the attached detailed Office action for a list | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | d. | |
| | | , | | |
| Attachmen | • • | | | |
| | e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da | | |
| 3) 🔲 Infori | mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date | 5) Notice of Informal P. 6) Other: | | 2) |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/15/2005 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been taken into consideration prior to drafting this office action. It is noted, however, that MPEP 2111.03 states that for the purposes of searching for and applying prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103, absent a clear indication in the specification or claims of what the basic and novel characteristics actually are, "consisting essentially of" will be construed as equivalent to "comprising" (Specification discloses and indicates in figure 7 that more than a single lens may be used and would not materially affect the basic operation of the claimed invention).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2883

Claims 1-3, 5, 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Number 5,799,121 to Duck et al (hereinafter Duck)., and further in view of United States Patent Number 4,111,524 to Tomlinson III (hereinafter Tomlinson).

Duck discloses in figure 3, a filter module consisting essentially of a single GRIN lens (14), optical fibers (10, 12), an optical filter (37), and a total reflection mirror (16) arranged to face the optical filter, wherein said optical fibers are arranged on a single side of said lens, wherein the filter module is configured to receive a signal and output a filtered portion of the signal and an unfiltered portion of the signal on the single side of said lens.

As to claim 6, the filter is a wavelength selective filter (column 3, line 6) and is substantially collimated (column 2, line 41).

However, Duck fails to explicitly disclose the use of three optical fibers, but does disclose the ability to use multiple fibers and multiple ports. Furthermore, Duck takes into consideration space savings

Tomlinson discloses in figure 2, an optical filter module with three optical fibers in a capillary (14) and a lens configured on one side of a reflective surface in order to multiplex light signals.

Since Duck and Tomlinson are both from the same field of endeavor, the use of three fibers as disclosed by Tomlinson would have been recognized in the pertinent art of Duck.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use three optical fibers on one side of a reflective surface as disclosed by

Application/Control Number: 10/680,886

Art Unit: 2883

Tomlinson in the filter module of Duck for the motivation of increasing bandwidth and saving space.

4. Claims 7-9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duck in view of Tomlinson (hereinafter DIT) as applied to claims above, and further in view of Applicant's disclosure of prior art.

DIT discloses an optical filter module as claimed, but fails to explicitly disclose multiple filter modules arranged together in a cascade formation. Examiner notes that DIT does not specifically limit the device to ONE module, and by merely providing for another module is commonly known in the art.

Applicant discloses in figure 9, such a cascade formation.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to arrange the module as disclosed by DIT in the cascade formation as disclosed by Applicant in order to increase bandwidth for a WDM system.

5. Claims 4, 10, 14-16, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DIT as applied to claims above, and further in view of United States Patent Number 6,499,886 to Mizuno et al.

DIT discloses the filter module as claimed except for a capillary tube having 3 walls connected to each other. It is noted that it is commonly known in the art to select a known shape to support optical fibers for the purposes of limiting movement. Naturally, a triangle shape with three walls would best suit the configuration of three fibers.

Mizuno et al. discloses a capillary tube having three walls holding three optical fibers shaped in a triangle.

Since DIT and Mizuno et al. are both from the same field of endeavor, the use of a capillary tube as disclosed by Mizuno et al. would have been recognized in the pertinent art of DIT.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the three walled triangle configuration disclosed by Mizuno et al. in the holding tube of DIT, for the purpose and motivation of further securing optical fibers in order to reduce movement and optical losses resulting therefrom.

Conclusion

- 6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
 - United States Patent Number 4,521,071 to Bohm. a.
 - b. United States Patent Number 4,474,424 to Wagner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eric Wong whose telephone number is 571-272-2363. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 830AM - 430PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Frank Font can be reached on 571-272-2415. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/680,886

Art Unit: 2883

Page 6

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

EW

Frank G. Font Supervisory Patent Examiner Technology Center 2800

Fail & FA